

province of British Columbia; and, in apology for doing so, I may say, that I visited that province in a political capacity for the first time, just prior to the meeting of this House, and it was that visit which induced me to take some little interest in the affairs of that province. I found that, while the people there knew and admitted that they have six very excellent gentlemen representing them in this House, but little was heard in this House of the grievances and wants of that province. I can say, at any rate, that during two sessions I have hardly heard a British Columbia question discussed in it. The question which has been referred to in this debate was, I believe, discussed in 1894, but the Government policy of bringing down railway subsidies at the very end of the session has always resulted in a very inadequate discussion of these matters; and the session of 1894 having lasted very long, I myself went away before the question of railway subsidies came before us, so that I had not the pleasure of hearing this question discussed. The only other question that I remember hearing discussed was the question of representation in the Cabinet for British Columbia, and I must say, that I listened to a very interesting and effective speech from the Controller of Inland Revenue on that subject. The hon. gentleman has the idea that he is in the Cabinet, but there are some grave doubts about it. He is not, at any rate, a first-class member of the Cabinet. I do not know whether he is a second or a third-class member, but there is a very decided difference between him and the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Just what the difference is, it is hard to define, but I might mention an incidental little difference of which the hon. gentleman is probably aware—a difference of \$2,000 a year—but, of course, he does not care about that. I might also mention, incidentally, that the statutes of this Parliament provide that Controllers of Inland Revenue and Customs and Solicitors General are not members of the Cabinet.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is wandering from the question.

Mr. MARTIN. While my hon. friend seems to resent the idea that I should interest myself in British Columbia matters, and attributes my interest to the approaching elections, rather than to any real desire to benefit the province, I am glad, at any rate, of this, that the matters which I have brought up are really of importance to the province, and that the members representing it have not been able to say, that I am in any way opposed to its interest in those matters. It is very fortunate that this particular matter should have been discussed here to-night. I myself have received some information upon it, and I think it will really be of advantage to the future railway development of the Kootenay district, that the

question was discussed here this evening. There is one respect in which my methods are different from those of the hon. gentlemen. Their method of representing their province is something on the principle of the still hunt. They are supporters of the Government, and believe that quietly, by their influence upon the Government, they can get for their province more than it could obtain by injudiciously bringing on a discussion. I take issue with them, and it is for that reason I introduced to-night this railway question of railway development. I believe that no harm can result from that. And I believe that if in bringing these questions up here for discussion the Government comes in incidentally for some criticism, and that criticism is well founded, the influence of hon. members supporting the Government is by no means hurt by such discussion. In fact, I believe that it is improved, and that when members find, as these gentlemen have found for the past five years or ten years, the Government has not given fair consideration to the wants of their province, it would have been much better if, years ago, these questions had been brought up in the House and fairly threshed out, allowing members like myself and others from the more eastern parts of the country opportunities of knowing what their province wants and judging whether the Government gives it or not.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT—VOTE ON THE REMEDIAL ACT.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the House adjourns, I wish to inquire of the Minister of Finance if any definite idea can be given as to when the debate on the Remedial Bill now before the House will close?

Mr. FOSTER. In the middle of the week before last I had some talk with the leader of the Opposition at which time we thought it might be possible to get a vote about the middle of the week following, that is last week. Last week, however, we came to the conclusion in talking it over that that would be pretty difficult to do. Since then the hon. gentleman has been kept out of the House by illness which we all deplore. We on this side of the House being very anxious to press the matter to a conclusion for various reasons, were of the mind that we should sit very late on Thursday night and Friday night so as to get a vote on Friday night late or Saturday morning. Talking the matter over with the whip of the Opposition side, that hon. gentleman was of the opinion that it would be rather difficult to bring about a vote on account of the number of gentlemen who wished to speak. For our part on this side, we were willing to cut our speeches—I said I for one was willing to leave out my speech—in order to get a vote. However, a proposi-

Mr. MARTIN.